take the most serious moral and political reflection to manage the knowledge that physics gave us six decades ago.

Now we face a similar, perhaps even greater, challenge. The mapping of the human genome and other advances in the life sciences have given humanity a range and breadth of knowledge just as potent in its possibility as the knowledge acquired by the great physicists of the mid-twentieth century. Our new knowledge in the life sciences contains within itself the seeds of good—for it is knowledge that could be used to cure the sick and enhance the lives of us all. But, like the knowledge gained by the physicists, the new knowledge acquired by biology and genetics can also be used to do great evil: and that is what human cloning is. It is a great evil. For it turns the gift of life into a product—a commodity.

We have just enough time, now, to create a set of legal boundaries to guide the deployment of the new genetic knowledge and the development of the new biotechnologies so that this good thing—enhanced understanding of the mysteries of life itself—serves good ends, not dehumanizing ends. We have just enough time to insure that we remain the masters of our technology, not its products. We should use that time well—which is to say, thoughtfully. The new knowledge from the life sciences demands of us a new moral seriousness and a new quality of public reflection. These are not issues to be resolved by politics-as-usual, any more than the issue of atomic energy could be resolved by politics-as-usual. These are issues that demand informed and courageous consciences.

As free people, we have the responsibility to make decisions about the deployment of our new genetic knowledge with full awareness of the profound moral issues at stake. The questions before us in this bill, and in setting the legal framework for the future development of biotechnology, are not questions that can be well-answered by a simple calculus of utility: will it ''work?'' The questions raised by our new biological and genetic knowledge summon us to remember that most ancient of moral teachings, enshrined in every moral system known to humankind: never, ever use another human being as a mere means to some other end. That principle is the foundation of human freedom.

When human life is special-ordered rather than conceived, ''human life'' will never be the same again. Begetting the human future, not manufacturing it, is the fork in the road before us. Indeed, to describe that fork in those terms is not quite right. For a manufactured human future is not a human, or humane, future.

The world is watching us, today. How the United States applies the moral wisdom of the ages to the new questions of the revolution in biotechnology will set an example, for good or for ill, for the rest of humankind. If we make the decision we should today, in support of Congressman's WELDON's bill, the world will know that there is nothing inexorable about human cloning, and that it is possible for us to guide, rather than be driven by, the new genetics. The world will know that there is a better, more humane way to deploy the power that science has put into our hands.

And the world will know that America still stands behind the pledge of our founding, a pledge to honor the integrity, the dignity, the sanctity, of every human life, as the foundation of our freedom.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, the manufacture of cloned human beings rightly alarms an overwhelming majority of Americans. Some 90 percent oppose human cloning, according to a recent Time/CNN poll. The National Bioethics Advisory Commission unanimously concluded that ''Any attempt to clone a child is uncertain in its outcome, is unacceptably dangerous to the fetus and, therefore, morally unacceptable.'' That is why this bill prohibits all human cloning.

A partial ban would allow for stockpiles of cloned human embryos to be produced, bought and sold without restrictions. Implantation of cloned embryos, a relatively easy procedure, would inevitably take place. Once cloned embryos are produced and available in laboratories, it is impossible to control what is done with them, so a partial ban is simply unenforceable.

It has been argued that this bill would have a negative impact on scientific research, but this assertion is unsupported, both by the language in the bill and by the testimony received by the Subcommittee on Crime during two hearings. The language in the bill allows for research in the use of nuclear transfer or other cloning techniques used to produce molecules, DNA, cells, tissues, organs, plants or animal. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, there is no language in the bill that would interfere with the use of in vitro fertilization, the administration of fertility-enhancing drugs, or the use of other medical procedures to assist a woman from becoming or remaining pregnant.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and oppose the substitute.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), a member of the committee.

(Ms. LOFGREN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this bill bans human cloning. Almost all of us agree with that. The problem is, the bill does much more. It makes cutting-edge science a crime. It would make somatic cell nuclear transfer a felony.

An egg is stripped of its 23 chromosomes, 46 chromosomes are taken from the cell, say, of a piece of skin, and inserted into the egg. In 2 weeks, there is a clump of cells, undifferentiated, without organs, internal structures, nerves. Each of these cells may grow into any kind of cell, to cure cancer, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, even spinal cord injuries. Use of one's own DNA for the curing cells avoids the danger of rejection.

Just last week, as reported at the annual meeting at the Society for Neuroscience in New Orleans, stem cells derived from somatic nuclear transfer technology were used with primates, paralyzed monkeys. Astonishingly, the monkeys were able to regain some movement. For paraplegics, this is a bright ray of hope.

Since when did outlawing research to cure awful diseases become the morally correct position? I believe that scientific research to save lives and ease suffering is highly moral and ethical and right. Some disagree and oppose this science. Well, they have the right to disagree, but nobody will force them to accept the cures that science may yield. If your religious beliefs will not let you accept a cure for your child's cancer, so be it. But do not expect the rest of America to let their loved ones suffer without cure.

Our job in Congress is not to pick the most restrictive religious view of science and then impose that view upon Federal law. We live in a Democracy, not a Theocracy.

Vote for the amendment that will save stem cell research and then we can all vote for a bill that bans cloning humans, and only that.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART).

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Weldon-Stupak bill.

Simply put, cloning another human being, especially for the purpose of conducting experiments on the tiniest form of human being, is wrong. It is clear that it violates a principle that I think we all accept of human individuality and human dignity. That is why it is imperative that all of us support this bill. It is a responsible and reasoned proposal, and it will ensure that we maintain our strong ethical principles. We must have ethical principles to guide scientific research and inquiry.

No one who supports this bill suggests that we stop scientific research. In fact, cloning has been used and should continue to be used to produce tissues. It should not, however, be used to produce human beings.

If we do not draw a clear line now, when will we do so? There are so many very serious questions that human cloning raises, questions about conducting experiments on a human being bred essentially for that purpose; questions about the evils of social and genetic engineering; questions about the rights and liberties of living beings, of human beings.

What about a being that is created in the laboratory and patented as a product? It is still a human being.

There are too many serious questions that human cloning brings to the fore. They all have very serious consequences. The consequences that human cloning raises are all ethical questions. For us to move forward and allow science to be conducted without ethical and moral intervention is just crazy.